REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-12, 14, 16, and 18 were pending prior to the final Office Action. Claims 3 and 11 have been cancelled and claims 20 and 21 have been added through this Reply. Therefore, claims 1, 4, 7-10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, and 21 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 9, 16, and 18 are independent. Claims 1, 9, 16, and 18 have been amended through this Reply. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seeks timely allowance of all pending claims.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant thanks the Examiner for granting a Personal Interview with the Applicant's representative on January 31, 2008. During the Interview, the Examiner agreed that an amendment to independent claims 1 and 9 to include, *inter alia*, "storing an attribute value in a private member field of the model element class in the same memory block ***as a declaring class*** . . . ***a nested handler class, wherein the nested handler class is a subclass of a generic handler class*** . . ." would overcome the outstanding 35 U.S.C. §112 first and second paragraph rejections. The Examiner also raised some issues regarding 35 U.S.C. §101 statutory requirements. Although the Applicant's representative did not agree with the Examiner's contention that the claims are non-statutory, it was agreed that independent claims 1 and 9 would be amended to include, *inter alia*, "a ***storage*** medium" in order to expedite prosecution. In addition, regarding the prior art rejection of claims 16 and 18, it was agreed that an amendment to these claims to include a singleton pattern as an abstract base class for handling inlined field values of the model element class configured to access the attribute value stored in the model element class, wherein a first subclass of the singleton model element field handler object comprises a typed model element field handler subclass defining a get value function (claim 16) or a set value function (claim 18) would overcome the outstanding rejection based on the cited portions of the applied prior art references.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, Second Paragraph

Claims 1 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention, these claims have been amended as agreed upon during the Interview of January 31, 2008 merely to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Claims 1 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner that claims 1 and 9 are indefinite, these claims have been amended as agreed upon during the Interview of January 31, 2008 merely to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wall et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087557)[hereinafter "Wall"[in view of Matula et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0165995)[hereinafter "Matula"]. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For a Section 103 rejection to be proper, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must be established. *See M.P.E.P. 2142.* One requirement to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness is that the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all claim limitations. *See M.P.E.P. 2142; M.P.E.P. 706.02(j).* Thus, if the cited references fail to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, in regard to claim 16, it is respectfully submitted that neither Wall nor Matula, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests, *inter alia*,

> "***storing the attribute value in a private member field of a model element class in a same memory block as a declaring class; declaring a nested handler class***, . . .
>
> ***providing a singleton model element field handler object comprising a singleton pattern as an abstract base class for handling inlined field values of the model element class*** configured to access the attribute value stored in the model element class, wherein ***a first subclass of the singleton model element field handler object comprises a typed model element field handler subclass defining a get value function*** . . . wherein the storage of the attribute value ***is separate*** from handling of the attribute value."

Claim 18 also recites the above-identified claim feature except that a first subclass of the singleton model element field handler object comprises a typed model element field handler subclass defining a ***set value function*** instead of a get value function.

As acknowledged by the Examiner during the Personal Interview of January 31, 2008, none of the cited portions of Wall and Matula teaches or suggests the above-identified claim features of claims 16 and 18. After careful review of the applied prior art references, Applicant respectfully submit that neither the cited portions nor any other portions of Wall and Matula teach or suggest the above-identified claim features of claims 16 and 18.

Wall merely discloses a conventional method and apparatus for providing access control for a decentralized or emergent model on a computer network in which a model is defined using hierarchical relationship of servers, models, and objects.

Matula, on the other hand, discloses a method for dynamic implementation of a Java Metadata Interface (JMI) to a metamodel in which JMI interfaces are implemented as subclasses of handler classes.

Applicant again respectfully submits that none of the cited prior art references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the steps of "storing the attribute value in a private member field of a model element class in a same memory block as a declaring class; declaring a nested handler class, . . . providing a singleton model element field handler object comprising a singleton pattern as an abstract base class for handling inlined field values of the model element class configured to access the attribute value stored in the model element class, wherein a first

subclass of the singleton model element field handler object comprises a typed model element field handler subclass defining a get value function (claim 16) or set value function (claim 18) . . . wherein the storage of the attribute value is separate from handling of the attribute value."

Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully requested to withdraw the obviousness rejection of claims 16 and 18 based on Wall and Matula.

New Claims

Claims 20 and 21 have been added to further clarify that the singleton pattern enables the data structure to instantiate only one instance of a particular object which is used for supplying functionality for other users who wish to call that one instance. Further, claim 20 depends from claim 1 and claim 21 depends from claim 9. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 20 and 21 are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency on corresponding allowable independent claim.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all pending claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By #58,755
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant